Case No.: 58502US004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor:

JOSEPH, STEPHEN C.P.

Application No.:

10/551093

Confirmation No.:

1630

Filed:

March 12, 2004

Group Art Unit:

Title:

SPRAY GUN WITH ROTATABLE RESERVOIR

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

	G OR TRANSMISSION 37 CFR § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this corresponder	nce is being:
	Postal Service on the date shown below with nail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for dria, VA 22313-1450.
transmitted by facsimile on the d Trademark Office at 571-273-83	ate shown below to the United States Patent and
iransmitted to United States Par via the Office electronic filing s	ent and Trademark Office on the date shown below- ystem.
October 2, 2009	QUILLA M. Wasser Signed by: College M. Williamer
Date	Signed by: Collegn M. Whaner

Dear Sir:

In response to the final action dated June 5, 2009 and the Advisory Action dated September 14, 2009, and prior to filing an appeal brief, a Panel Review of the legal and factual basis of the rejections in the above-identified application is hereby requested. No amendments are being filed with this request. This Pre-Appeal Brief and Request for Review is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

rees

\boxtimes	Any required fee will be made at the time of submission via EFS Web. In the event fees are
	not or cannot be paid at the time of EFS-Web submission, please charge any fees under
	37 CFR § 1.17 which may be required to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.
	Please charge any fees under 37 CFR §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.
\boxtimes	Please charge any additional fees associated with the prosecution of this application to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. This authorization includes the fee for any necessary extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136(a). To the extent any such extension should become necessary, it is hereby requested.

Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

The pending claims are claims 6-14. Claims 6, 13 and 14 stand rejected. Claims 7-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Review is Requested for the Following Reasons

Claims 6, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,971 (Morck). The Patent Office has not established a legally sufficient case demonstrating that Applicants' claims are *prima facie* obvious in view of Morck because the following elements required by Applicants' independent claim 6 are *not* disclosed by Morck.

1. "Connector Means Connecting an Outlet from the Reservoir to the Inlet of the Spray Gun" Applicants' "connector means" comprises "at least one resilient clip... engageable with an abutment." The Patent Office has equated Morck's stop spring 33 with the resilient clip and Morck's snap-in notches 32 with the abutment. In Morck, stop spring 33 is formed on housing part 18 and snap-in notches 32 are provided on housing part 17. The Patent Office has equated housing part 17 with Applicants' reservoir. However, housing part 18 cannot be the inlet for Morck's spray gun because "sealing elements are present to prevent foaming agent from entering the interior of housing part 18." The Patent Office previously acknowledged this stating that "housing part 18 has never been designated as the spray gun inlet." Thus, Morck's stop spring 33 and snap-in notches 32 cannot "connect an outlet from the reservoir to the inlet of the spray gun."

2. A "Spring Leg [That] Can Rotate Relative to the Ledge"

Applicants' resilient clip comprises a "spring leg" and the abutment comprises a "ledge." The spring leg engages the ledge and can rotate relative to the ledge. The Patent Office has equated Morck's stop spring 33 with the spring leg and snap-in notches 32 with the ledge. Stop spring 33 is formed on housing part 18 and snap-in notches 32 are provided on housing part 17.

¹ See January 30, 2009 Office action (§2), June 5, 2009 Office action (§3), and September 14, 2009 Advisory Action (§11).

² Column 4, lines 20-28. See April 29, 2009 Response, pages 4-5, and August 24, 2009 Response, pages 4-5.

³ See September 14, 2009 Advisory Action (§11).

⁴ Column 5, lines 46-52.

⁵ See June 5, 2009 Office action (§5),

⁶ See January 30, 2009 Office action (§2) and June 5, 2009 Office action (§3).

Column 4, lines 20-28. See April 29, 2009 Response, pages 4-5, and August 24, 2009 Response, pages 4-5.

"Housing part 17... is adapted to be rotated... relative to housing part 18." Thus, Morek's snap-in notches 32 (which are formed on housing part 17) rotate relative to stop spring 33 (which is formed on housing part 18.) This is the opposite of what Applicants claim.

3. "Reservoir Outlet and Spray Gun Inlet Connectable by Push Fit"

The Patent Office previously contended that this feature was found in Morck, but that was when a different element was regarded as the reservoir, not housing part 17. The Patent Office has not shown that Morck's housing part 17 (the element now equated to Applicants' reservoir) and Morck's spray gun inlet are connectable by a push fit. Morck does not disclose that these elements are connectable by a push fit.

4. "Connector Means Being Releasable for Detaching the Outlet From the Inlet"

The Patent Office previously contended that this feature was found in Morck, but that was when a different element was regarded as the reservoir having an outlet, not housing part 17. The Patent Office has not shown that Morck's stop spring 33 and snap-in notches 32 (the elements collectively associated with Applicants' "connector means") are releasable for detaching the outlet of housing part 17 (the element now equated to Applicants' reservoir) from Morck's spray gun inlet. Morck does not disclose that stop spring 33 and snap-in notches 32 are releasable for detaching the outlet of housing part 17 from the spray gun inlet.

Conclusion

Review and withdrawal of their rejections are respectfully requested. By setting forth the clear grounds of error, Applicants do not assert that these are the only errors that the Patent Office has made, nor do Applicants waive any arguments that may be asserted in an Appeal Brief. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments in the Appeal Brief in relation to the independent and also the dependent claims.

3

⁸ Column 3, lines 58-61.

⁹ See January 30, 2009 Office action (\$2) and June 5, 2009 Office action (\$3) referring to Morek column 3, line 40 disclosure of "a pressure can for the medium (not shown)" as the reservoir.

10 Id.

Applicants respectfully request that the Panel review and reverse the final rejections of claims 6, 13 and 14 in the above-identified application and that a Panel Decision allowing the application on the existing claims be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

October 2,009

Steven E. Skolnick, Reg. No.: 33,789

Telephone No.: 651-736-6935

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel 3M Innovative Properties Company

Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833